

HOUSE BILL REPORT

HB 2854

As Reported by House Committee On:
Local Government

Title: An act relating to reporting compliance with countywide planning policy requirements.

Brief Description: Requiring the reporting of compliance with countywide planning policy requirements.

Sponsors: Representative Miloscia.

Brief History:

Committee Activity:

Local Government: 1/22/08, 2/4/08 [DPS].

Brief Summary of Substitute Bill

- Obligates the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development to submit a report to the House of Representatives and Senate every three years that analyzes compliance with the countywide planning policy requirements of the Growth Management Act.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Majority Report: The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 4 members: Representatives Simpson, Chair; Takko, Vice Chair; Eddy and Nelson.

Minority Report: Do not pass. Signed by 3 members: Representatives Warnick, Ranking Minority Member; Schindler, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Schmick.

Staff: Ethan Moreno (786-7386).

Background:

The Growth Management Act (GMA or Act) is the comprehensive land use planning framework for county and city governments in Washington. Enacted in 1990 and 1991, the GMA establishes numerous requirements for local governments obligated by mandate or choice to fully plan under the Act (planning jurisdictions) and a reduced number of directives

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not a part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

for all other counties and cities. Twenty-nine of Washington's 39 counties, and the cities within those counties, are planning jurisdictions. The Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (DCTED) provides technical and financial assistance to jurisdictions that must implement requirements of the GMA.

The GMA directs planning jurisdictions to adopt internally consistent comprehensive land use plans that are generalized, coordinated land use policy statements of the governing body. Comprehensive plans must address specified planning elements, each of which is a subset of a comprehensive plan. Planning jurisdictions must also adopt development regulations that implement and conform with the comprehensive plan.

The legislative authority of each county that fully plans under the GMA must adopt a countywide planning policy (CPP) in cooperation with the cities located wholly or partially within the county. A CPP is a written policy statement or statements used solely for establishing a countywide framework from which county and city comprehensive plans are developed and adopted.

Countywide planning policies must include specified planning provisions. Examples include:

- policies to implement requirements for urban growth areas designated under the GMA;
- policies for siting public capital facilities of a countywide or statewide nature; and
- policies that consider the need for affordable housing, such as housing for all economic segments of the population and parameters for its distribution.

The Governor may impose sanctions upon a planning jurisdiction that fails to adopt CPPs in conformity with the GMA.

Summary of Substitute Bill:

On or before December 1, 2008, and every three years thereafter, the DCTED must submit to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report analyzing compliance with the countywide planning policy requirements of the GMA.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:

Requires the DCTED to complete a proposed report analyzing compliance with countywide planning policies every three years rather than annually.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Effective Date of Substitute Bill: The bill takes effect 90 days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Staff Summary of Public Testimony:

(In support) This bill is part of ongoing efforts with agencies and stakeholders to improve the GMA.

(Opposed) The GMA has caused numerous problems in Clark County and is slowing the growth rate in the fast-growing county. The amount of land available for development in the county has been artificially reduced by the GMA. Clark County planned successfully before the GMA and the additional regulations it imposes are unnecessary. The GMA has not worked in Clark County: it has stifled home ownership and increased land costs.

Persons Testifying: (In support) Rep. Miloscia, prime sponsor.

(Opposed) John Matson.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: None.